

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,
v.
RICARDO BANUELOS,
Defendant.

2:07-CR-137 JCM (RJJ)

ORDER

15 Presently before the court is petitioner Ricardo Banuelos's letter requesting the status of his
16 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. (Doc. # 113). Although letters to the court are usually disregarded, *see*
17 Fed. R. Civ. P. 7 (a document requesting a court order must be styled as a motion, not a letter), the
18 court makes an exception under these circumstances.

19 The government filed a motion for leave to file a late response to petitioner's 28 U.S.C. §
20 2255 motion (doc. # 107) and the court granted the motion (doc. # 108). Subsequently, the
21 government timely complied with the extension of time. (*See* doc. # 109). The court then granted
22 petitioner an extension of time to file his reply. (Doc. # 112). Petitioner then filed the instant letter.
23 (Doc. # 113).

24 | . . .

25

26

27

28

Because this letter indicates that petitioner has not received the court's order granting defendant the initial extension of time of reply;¹ the court finds that an additional thirty (30) day extension of time is warranted.

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that petitioner shall have up
5 to and including November 24, 2012, to file a reply to the government's response.

6 DATED October 23, 2012.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ It appears that manual distribution in this case has caused some delay in communication between the parties and the court.